Remarks

At present, claims 1-4 are indicated as being rejected on form PTOL-326. However, the Examiner's stated rejection beginning on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action indicates that only claims 1 and 2 stand rejected. However, applicants' herein provide this response under the assumption that claims 1-4 are all rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based upon the patent to Sethuram et al. (US patent number 5,828,903 issued October 27, 1998). In light of the comments presented below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is a well-understood and incontroverted principle of patent law that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that all claim elements be found within the four corners of a single cited document. Any minor exceptions to this rule are not relevant to the present rejection. Accordingly, for a successful traversal of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, it is only necessary that an applicant point out at least one difference between the proffered claim and that which is taught by the cited art. In particular, it is noted that this response points out two differences. Furthermore, contrary to the Examiner's interpretation of the words 'real' versus 'virtual' as set forth in the Office Action, applicants nonetheless continue to assert the applicability of the earlier arguments made in the previous response with respect to the relevancy of this difference as well.

The Examiner's attention is particularly directed to applicants' third claim step. This step recites the following operation: "transferring, from said second data processing system to said adapter, real address information indicating desired target memory locations for said message." It is also noted that this transfer of information occurs in response to a transfer from the adapter to the associated data processing system an indication that temporary memory in the adapter now contains the message

received. Nowhere in the patent to Sethuram et al. is there any teaching, disclosure or suggestion of the transfer of real address information from a receiving host system to its associated adapter.

In support of the assertion that this teaching is found in the cited patent, the Examiner points to several portions of the patent to Sethuram et al. In particular, the Examiner points to column 4, lines 33-44; column 4, lines 57 through column 5, line 1; and additionally to column 5, lines 15-20. With respect to this reference to the subject patent, it is noted that even if each virtual register mapped to a particular free buffer, there is nothing contained in that recitation or citation which provides an indication that real address information is being transferred from the data processing system to the adapter.

With respect to the citation to the portion of the cited patent found in column 4, lines 33-44, it is noted that Sethuram et al. refer to an initialization process in which the host device sets up the free buffers and creates corresponding virtual registers. However, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion that these registers are set up, established or filled with any real address information. Furthermore, it is the teaching of Sethuram et al. that the creation of the virtual registers is an operation that occurs at an initialization time, not during a time of data transfer. In contrast, it is noted that, in applicants' claimed invention, the transfer of real address information from the data processing system to its associated adapter occurs in response to the transfer of data and more particularly in response to a signal sent from the adapter to its associated data processing node that indicates that the adapter now completely contains the message received.

With respect to the Examiner's citation of that portion of the patent to Sethuram et al. found in column 4, line 57 though column 5, line 1, it is noted that this portion of the patent asserts therein that the DMA engine uses the incoming virtual circuit number to access the virtual register that contains the address to the corresponding buffer in host memory. Again, it is noted that there is nothing found in the cited patent portion to teach, disclose or even suggest that real address information is being transferred from a host to an adapter.

Accordingly, it is seen that applicants' teachings found within their third claim step differ significantly from the teachings found in the patent to Sethuram et al. In particular, the subject patent contains no teaching, disclosure or suggestion for the transfer of real address information indicating desired target memory locations from the data processing system to its associated adapter. In particular, it is noted that no such transfer is initiated when the receiving data processing system is provided with an indication that the temporary memory in the adapter contains the received message. Accordingly, since this is a difference between the claimed invention and the art cited by the Examiner, it is therefore clear that the Examiner's rejection of applicants' claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) cannot be sustained. Accordingly, it is therefore respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.

In addition to the differences cited above, the Examiner's attention is also directed to applicants' fifth claim step, which recites: "transferring, from said adapter to said second data processing system, an indication that the target location now contains the message received from said first data processing system." This step is not taught, disclosed or suggested by the patent to Sethuram et al. Accordingly, this recited step also forms a foundation for yet another difference between the art and applicants' claims.

In support of the Examiner's assertion that this claim step is found within the patent to Sethuram et al., the Examiner relies upon the recitation found in column 6, line 54, of the subject patent. In the pertinent part, the subject patent states: "After completion of the transfer of an entire data packet unit (PDU) or frame indicating completion of receive of a current transmission . . . ." It is absolutely clear that the teachings of Sethuram et al. refer to notifying the host device when the complete data message has arrived. In stark contrast, applicants' claim specifically recites a step in which the adapter notifies the host system that the target locations within the host system now contain the message that was received. These are completely different operations. The operation in applicants' claimed invention refers to a claim step in which the adapter notifies its associated data processing system that transfer of message data into the host system is completed. In contrast, the patent to Sethuram et al. teaches only a notification to its host system that the message has been received at the adapter. These are different operations. There is no indication in the patent to Sethuram et al. that there is any indication provided from the adapter to the host that transfer of data from the adapter to the host has been completed.

Accordingly, it is seen that this is yet another difference found between applicants' claims and the art cited by the Examiner. As above, it is also seen that this difference precludes the rejection of applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, it is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

It is noted that the present response does not require the payment of any additional fees. It is further noted that the present response is being submitted within the two-month time permitted for responses under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that the Examiner provide applicants with an Advisory Action within the required 30-day period, that is, prior to December 17, 2004.

Accordingly, it is now seen that all of the applicants' claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, early notification of the allowability of applicants' claims is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if there are any matters which the Examiner feels could be expeditiously considered and which would forward the prosecution of the instant application, applicants' attorney wishes to indicate his willingness to engage in any telephonic communication in furtherance of this objective. Accordingly, applicants' attorney may be reached for this purpose at the numbers provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nov. 16, 2004
Date

Lawrence D. Cutter
LAWRENCE D. CUTTER, Sr. Attorney
Reg. No. 28,501

IBM Corporation, IP Law Dept.
2455 South Rd., M/S P386
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Phone: (845) 433-1172
FAX: (845) 432-9786
EMAIL: cutter@us.ibm.com